

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claims 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 11, 12, 16-19 and 30-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruth (U.S. Pat. No. 3,737,047) in view of Devening (U.S. Pat. No. 4,941,578). Claim 24 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The allowable subject matter of dependent claim 24 has been incorporated into independent claims 11 and 19. Therefore, independent claims 11 and 19 and the claims dependent therefrom should be in condition for allowance.

With respect to the rejection of claims 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, support for claim 32 can be found at page 4, lines 16-18 of the specification, and support for claim 33 can be found at page 4, lines 20-21 of the specification. Therefore, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.


Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims in the present application, as they now stand, patentably distinguish

over the references cited and applied by the Examiner and are, therefore, in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is in order, and such favorable action and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

However, if after reviewing the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN, PLLC

By:   
Jonathan L. Scherer  
Reg. No. 29,851

400 Seventh Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2201  
(202) 638-6666  
Date: December 21, 2007  
JLS/crj